



AF JFW

PTO/SB/21 (02-04)
Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

TRANSMITTAL FORM (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)	Application Number	09/748,952	
	Filing Date	December 27, 2000	
	First Named Inventor	B. Menez	
	Art Unit	2153	
	Examiner Name	K. Lim	
Total Number of Pages in This Submission	30	Attorney Docket Number	PU010001

ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form <input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached <input type="checkbox"/> Amendment/Reply <input type="checkbox"/> After Final <input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request <input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement <input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts/Incomplete Application <input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53	<input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers <input type="checkbox"/> Petition <input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application <input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation <input type="checkbox"/> Change of Correspondence Address <input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer <input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund <input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance communication to Technology Center (TC) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) <input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information <input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter <input type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):
<div>Remarks</div>		

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT	
Firm or Individual name	Thomson Licensing Inc.
Signature	
Date	5/8/06

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below.	
Typed or printed name	Joel Fogelson
Signature	
Date	5/8/06

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.



Serial No. 09/748,952
Customer No. 24498

PATENT
PU010001

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Applicant : B. MENEZ
Serial No. : 09/748,952
Filed : DECEMBER 27, 2000
Title : A SCHEDULER APPARATUS EMPLOYING A GOPHER
AGENT THAT SENDS E-MAIL MESSAGES FOR USE
IN A TELEVISION RECEIVER
Examiner : K. LIM
Art Unit : 2153

APPLICANT'S APPEAL BRIEF

May It Please The Honorable Board:

Applicant appeals the rejection of Claims 1-12 and 19-21 of the above-identified application in the Rejection mailed September 9, 2005 and request that such action be reversed. The \$ 500.00 fee for filing this Appeal Brief is to be charged to Deposit Account 07-0832, for the Appeal Brief filed on August 22, 2005. Applicant also requests a three-month extension under 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a) to file this brief from February 8, 2006. The fee for the extension is to be charged to the above mentioned Deposit Account, as well.

05/23/2006 RNEBRAHT 00000003 070832 09748952

01 FC:1402 500.00 DA
02 FC:1253 1020.00 DA

Please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to the above-identified Deposit Account.

Applicant does not request an oral hearing.

REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest, the Assignee, is:

Thomson Licensing

46 Quai Alphonse Le Gallo

92648 Boulogne Cedex

FRANCE

RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no related appeals or interferences.

STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-12 and 19-21 are rejected

Claims 1-12 and 19-21 are appealed.

STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

All amendments were entered and are reflected in the claims included in the Appendix I.

SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION

System Claim 1 discloses an apparatus that provides a function of informing a user when a selected program will be aired by sending an electronic message to an e-mail address informing the user about such a broadcast. A memory unit is used to store the e-mail address (page 12, lines 19-21, 415) which can be entered in by using a data entry means (page 5, lines 18-21, 450). A control means is then programmed to search through channel guide listings to locate programming that matches user specified information (page 13, line 5 to page 14, line 8, 450).

When the search is completed, the control means sends an electronic message to an e-mail address indicating the availability of a television programming matching such user specified information (page 13, lines 5 to page 14, line 8, 450). The system also includes an on-screen display that renders text and/or graphics related to the search (page 12, lines 17-19, 415) and a means for selecting a program for viewing (page 5, lines 18-21, 450).

System Claim 4 presents the additional features of having the apparatus providing a user instructions how to record a matching television program and how to notify a user of the availability of such a program via e-mail (page 14, lines 20 to page 15, lines 12, Fig. 7).

System Claim 10 discloses an apparatus that provides a function of informing a user when a selected program will be aired by sending an electronic message to an e-mail address informing the user about such a broadcast. A memory unit is used to store the e-mail address and channel guide list information (page 12, lines 19-21, 415) which is searched during a search operation. The e-mail address can be entered in by using a data entry

means (page 5, lines 18-21, 450) such as a remote control. A control means is then programmed to search through channel guide listings to locate programming that matches user specified information (page 13, line 5 to page 14, line 8, 450).

When the search is completed, the control means sends an electronic message to an e-mail address indicating the availability of a television programming matching such user specified information (page 13, lines 5 to page 14, line 8, 450). The system also includes an on-screen display that renders text and/or graphics related to the search (page 12, lines 17-19, 415).

Method Claim 11 discloses an apparatus that provides a function of informing a user when a selected program will be aired by sending an electronic message to an e-mail address informing the user about such a broadcast. A memory unit is used to store the e-mail address and channel guide list information (page 12, lines 19-21, 415) which is searched during a search operation to locate programming that matches user specified information (page 13, line 5 to page 14, line 8, 450). When the search is completed, the control means sends an electronic message to an e-mail address indicating the availability of a television programming matching such user specified information (page 13, lines 5 to page 14, line 8, 450).

GROUND OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

(1) Whether the systems claimed in Claims 1-3, 5-9, and 19 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Alten et al. (U.S. Patent 6,396,546);

(2) Whether the system claimed in Claim 4 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Alten et al. (U.S. Patent 6,396,546);

(3) Whether the systems claimed in Claims 10, 12, and 20 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Alten et al. (U.S. Patent 6,396,546);

(4) Whether the methods claimed in Claims 11 and 21 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Alten et al. (U.S. Patent 6,396,546).

ARGUMENTS

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) REJECTION OF SYSTEM CLAIMS 1-3, 5-9, and 19

Reversal of the Rejection of Claims 1-3, 5-9, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Alten et al. (U.S. Patent 6,396,546, hereafter 'Alten') is respectfully requested for the following reasons.

The Applicant's invention in Claim 1 claims a system for searching through channel guide information for matching user-entered data, and sending "an electronic message to the user at the e-mail address to notify said user of an availability of said television program" in response to a successful search result.

The Examiner in the rejection writes that, "while Alten et al. disclosed the electronic program scheduled system which included specific command icons that allowed a user to electronically communicate or interact with the system (e.g., Pay Per View Confirmation or request to order the movie. etc.), Alten et al. did not explicitly mention that this communication was done by the e-mail method," (Office Action, page 3). Hence the Examiner concludes that because "e-mail method for automatically or electronically passes back and forth information between users/computers through the computer network is a well-known feature in the art at the time the invention was made. Thus, it would have been obvious to the ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to recognize that such using e-mail to notify the user would have been obvious existed in Alten's cable system in order for the user to electronically communicate with the electronic program schedule system," (Office Action, pages 3-4).

Applicant notes that the Examiner bears the burden of establishing a prima facie case of obviousness and "can satisfy this burden only by showing some objective teaching in the prior art or that knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art would lead that individual to combine the relevant teachings of the references." In re Fine, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). To support a conclusion that a claimed combination is obvious, either: (a) the references must expressly or impliedly suggest the claimed combination to one of ordinary skill in the art, or (b) the examiner must present a convincing line of reasoning as to why a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teachings of the references. Ex parte Clapp, 227 U.S.P.Q. 972, 973 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985).

In the rejection for Claim 1, the Examiner has not established why one of the ordinary skill in the art would combine the system of Alten with an e-mail notification system as to indicate why "upon successful conclusion of said search, said control means sends an electronic message to the user at the e-mail address to notify said user of an availability of said television program". That is, the Examiner argues that because e-mail is well known, it is obvious to combine Alten with the features of e-mail, to anticipate the features of Claim 1. This however is not the appropriate standard for an anticipation rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a),

The Examiner must show "some objective teaching in the prior art or that knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art would lead that individual to combine the relevant teachings of the references" see In re Fine, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596. This rationale is not disclosed or suggested in

the Examiner's rejection.

Moreover, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Alten why e-mail would be used as a notification source "upon successful conclusion of said search, said control means sends an electronic message to the user at the e-mail address to notify said user of an availability of said television program" as claimed in Claim 1. For example, the Examiner cites to Fig. 24 in Alten as being similar to the claimed electronic message of Claim 1 indicating the availability of a television program. The pay per view confirmation of Fig. 24, however, is used for a different function, where the confirmation is used to confirm whether or not a user wants to order a specific movie, in this case "Passenger 57". This pay per view confirmation is not the same thing as "sending an electronic message to the user at the at an e-mail address to notify said user of an availability of said television program".

Furthermore, the claim requires that the claimed e-mail of Claim 1 be sent "upon successful conclusion of said search". The search claimed in Claim 1 is a different operation than the ordering of a movie as shown in Figs. 22 and 23 of Alten; as such an operation is to purchase a viewing of a movie. Additionally, Alten does not disclose or suggest why a user would want the results of purchasing a movie would or should be transmitted as e-mail to "an e-mail address" which in the manner suggested by the Examiner. A user would probably want to confirm the purchase of a movie at the time the movie was being purchased, versus having the results of such a confirmation transmitted to a remote e-mail address to an apparatus that exists away from a television system.

The Examiner, in the Office Action, argues against the Applicant's

remarks that the use of e-mail with Alten is obvious because "using the e-mail for automatically or electronically passed back for information between users/computers through the computer network is a well known feature in the art at the time the invention was made".

The Examiner cites to a section of Alten as supporting this conclusion. Specifically, the Examiner writes, "the data stream can be transmitted on the cable line in any number of ways and those skilled in the art will understand that numerous transmission schemes may be used to transmit the data stream," (Alten, col. 7, lines 53-58). The paragraph to which the Examiner cites then discloses further ways a data provider, such as a broadcaster, may transmit a data stream, such as embedding the data stream in the vertical blanking interval of a program broadcast signal (Alten, col. 7, lines 58-63). This disclosure of Alten is based upon how a broadcaster or data provider can provide an input signal 11 to a receiver 12. This teaching of Alten has nothing to do with disclosing or suggestion how one could send an electronic message to a third party (either from a broadcaster or the receiver 12 based upon the results of a search) without applying hindsight analysis in view of the Applicant's invention (M.P.E.P. 2145).

The Examiner answer to the Applicant's argument about the application of hindsight analysis to the rejection of the Claim 1 that the "Applicant is reminded not only are the teachings of the prior art taken into consideration, but the level of the ordinary skill in the pertinent art. See *In re Luck*, 177 U.S.P.Q. 523 (C.C.P.A. 1973)," (Office Action, page 7). In such, the Applicant asserts that the Examiner has not established why one would want modify Alten to cause such a system to transmit a "program located"

notification to an e-mail address away from a television receiver, but for the elements listed in Claim 1.

For the foregoing reasons given above, Applicant asserts that Claim 1 is patentable and requests that the Examiner reverse the rejection of this claim. Applicant also requests that the Examiner remove the rejection to ~~Claims 2-3, 5-9, and 19~~ for the same reasons listed for Claim 1.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) REJECTION OF SYSTEM CLAIM 4

Reversal of the Rejection of Claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Alten is respectfully requested for the following reasons.

Claim 4 claims the elements of "after successful completion of each search include instructions to record said television program and instructions to notify the user of an availability of said television program by sending said electronic message to said user". The Examiner's rejection does not disclose or suggest all these claimed features as to establish a prima facie as required under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

In the rejection, the Examiner writes, "using the e-mail method for automatically or electronically passed information back and forth between users/computers through the computer network is a well known feature in the art at the time the invention was made. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to recognize that such using e-mail to notify the user would have been obvious existed in Alten's cable system in order for the user to electronically communicate with the electronic program schedule system," (Office Action, page 4).

Applicant notes that this rejection neither discloses or suggests the claimed features of "after successful completion of each search include instructions to record said television program and instructions to notify the user of an availability of said television program by sending said electronic message to said user" as claimed in Claim 4. Or, why one of the ordinary skill in the art would modify Alten to display instructions for both recording a

skill in the art would modify Alten to display instructions for both recording a located television program and for notifying a user of the availability of a television program by sending an electronic message to an e-mail address, as claimed in Claim 4.

For the foregoing reasons given above, Applicant asserts that Claim 4 is patentable and requests that the Examiner reverse the rejection of this claim.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) REJECTION OF SYSTEM CLAIMS 10, 12, and 20

Reversal of the Rejection of Claims 10, 12, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Alten is respectfully requested for the following reasons.

The Applicant's invention in Claim 10 claims a system for searching through channel guide information for matching user-entered data, and sending "an electronic message to the user at the e-mail address to notify said user of an availability of said television program" in response to a successful search result.

The Examiner in the rejection writes that, "while Alten et al. disclosed the electronic program scheduled system which included specific command icons that allowed a user to electronically communicate or interact with the system (e.g., Pay Per View Confirmation or request to order the movie. etc.) Alten et al. did not explicitly mention that this communication was done by the e-mail method," (Office Action, page 3). Hence the Examiner concludes that because "e-mail method for automatically or electronically passes back and forth information between users/computers through the computer network is a well-known feature in the art at the time the invention was made. Thus, it would have been obvious to the ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to recognize that such using e-mail to notify the user would have been obvious existed in Alten's cable system in order for the user to electronically communicate with the electronic program schedule system," (Office Action, pages 3-4).

Applicant notes that the Examiner bears the burden of establishing a prima facie case of obviousness and "can satisfy this burden only by showing

some objective teaching in the prior art or that knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art would lead that individual to combine the relevant teachings of the references." In re Fine, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). To support a conclusion that a claimed combination is obvious, either: (a) the references must expressly or impliedly suggest the claimed combination to one of ordinary skill in the art, or (b) the examiner must present a convincing line of reasoning as to why a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teachings of the references. Ex parte Clapp, 227 U.S.P.Q. 972, 973 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985).

In the rejection for Claim 10, the Examiner has not established why one of the ordinary skill in the art would combine the system of Alten with an e-mail notification system as to indicate why "upon successful conclusion of said search, said control means sends an electronic message to the user at the e-mail address to notify said user of an availability of said television program". That is, the Examiner argues that because e-mail is well known, it is obvious to combine Alten with the features of e-mail, to anticipate the features of Claim 10. This however is not the appropriate standard for an anticipation rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a),

The Examiner must show "some objective teaching in the prior art or that knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art would lead that individual to combine the relevant teachings of the references" see In re Fine, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596. This rationale is not disclosed or suggested in the Examiner's rejection.

Moreover, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Alten why e-mail

would be used as a notification source "upon successful conclusion of said search, said control means sends an electronic message to the user at the e-mail address to notify said user of an availability of said television program" as claimed in Claim 10. For example, the Examiner cites to Fig. 24 in Alten as being similar to the claimed electronic message of Claim 10 indicating the availability of a television programming. The pay per view confirmation of Fig. 24, however, is used for a different function, where the confirmation is used to confirm whether or not a user wants to order a specific movie, in this case "Passenger 57". This pay per view confirmation is not the same thing as "sending an electronic message to the user at the at an e-mail address to notify said user of an availability of said television program".

Furthermore, the claim requires that the claimed e-mail of Claim 10 be sent "upon successful conclusion of said search". The search claimed in Claim 10 is a different operation than the ordering of a movie as shown in Figs. 22 and 23 of Alten; as such an operation is to purchase a viewing of a movie. Additionally, Alten does not disclose or suggest why a user would want the results of purchasing a movie would or should be transmitted as e-mail to "an e-mail address" which in the manner suggested by the Examiner. A user would probably want to confirm the purchase of a movie at the time the movie was being purchased, versus having the results of such a confirmation transmitted to a remote e-mail address to an apparatus that exists away from a television system.

The Examiner, in the Office Action, argues against the Applicant's remarks that the use of e-mail with Alten is obvious because "using the e-mail for automatically or electronically passed back for information between

users/computers through the computer network is a well known feature in the art at the time the invention was made".

The Examiner cites to a section of Alten as supporting this conclusion. Specifically, the Examiner writes, "the data stream can be transmitted on the cable line in any number of ways and those skilled in the art will understand that numerous transmission schemes may be used to transmit the data stream," (Alten, col. 7, lines 53-58). The paragraph to which the Examiner cites then discloses further ways a data provider, such as a broadcaster, may transmit a data stream, such as embedding the data stream in the vertical blanking interval of a program broadcast signal (Alten, col. 7, lines 58-63). This disclosure of Alten is based upon how a broadcaster or data provider can provide an input signal 11 to a receiver 12. This teaching of Alten has nothing to do with disclosing or suggestion how one could send an electronic message to a third party (either from a broadcaster or the receiver 12 based upon the results of a search) without applying hindsight analysis in view of the Applicant's invention (M.P.E.P. 2145).

The Examiner answer to the Applicant's argument about the application of hindsight analysis to the rejection of the Claim 10 is that the "Applicant is reminded not only are the teachings of the prior art taken into consideration, but the level of the ordinary skill in the pertinent art. See *In re Luck*, 177 U.S.P.Q. 523 (C.C.P.A. 1973)," (Office Action, page 7). In such, the Applicant asserts that the Examiner has not established why one would want modify Alten to cause such a system to transmit a "program located" notification to an e-mail address away from a television receiver, but for the elements listed in Claim 10.

For the foregoing reasons given above, Applicant asserts that Claim 10 is patentable and requests that the Examiner reverse the rejection of this claim. Applicant also requests that the Examiner remove the rejection to Claims 12 and 20 for the same reasons listed for Claim 10.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) REJECTION OF METHOD CLAIMS 11 and 21

Reversal of the Rejection of Claims 11 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Alten is respectfully requested for the following reasons.

The Applicant's invention in Claim 11 claims a method for searching through channel guide information for matching user-entered data, and sending "an electronic message to the user at the e-mail address to notify said user of an availability of said television program" in response to a successful search result.

The Examiner in the rejection writes that, "while Alten et al. disclosed the electronic program scheduled system which included specific command icons that allowed a user to electronically communicate or interact with the system (e.g., Pay Per View Confirmation or request to order the movie. etc.) Alten et al. did not explicitly mention that this communication was done by the e-mail method," (Office Action, page 3). Hence the Examiner concludes that because "e-mail method for automatically or electronically passes back and forth information between users/computers through the computer network is a well-known feature in the art at the time the invention was made. Thus, it would have been obvious to the ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to recognize that such using e-mail to notify the user would have been obvious existed in Alten's cable system in order for the user to electronically communicate with the electronic program schedule system," (Office Action, pages 3-4).

Applicant notes that the Examiner bears the burden of establishing a prima facie case of obviousness and "can satisfy this burden only by showing

some objective teaching in the prior art or that knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art would lead that individual to combine the relevant teachings of the references." In re Fine, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). To support a conclusion that a claimed combination is obvious, either: (a) the references must expressly or impliedly suggest the claimed combination to one of ordinary skill in the art, or (b) the examiner must present a convincing line of reasoning as to why a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teachings of the references. Ex parte Clapp, 227 U.S.P.Q. 972, 973 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985).

In the rejection for Claim 11, the Examiner has not established why one of the ordinary skill in the art would combine the system of Alten with an e-mail notification system as to indicate why "upon successful conclusion of said search, said control means sends an electronic message to the user at the e-mail address to notify said user of an availability of said television program". That is, the Examiner argues that because e-mail is well known, it is obvious to combine Alten with the features of e-mail, to anticipate the features of Claim 11. This however is not the appropriate standard for an anticipation rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a),

The Examiner must show "some objective teaching in the prior art or that knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art would lead that individual to combine the relevant teachings of the references" see In re Fine, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596. This rationale is not disclosed or suggested in the Examiner's rejection.

Moreover, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Alten why e-mail

would be used as a notification source "upon successful conclusion of said search, said control means sends an electronic message to the user at the e-mail address to notify said user of an availability of said television program" as claimed in Claim 11. For example, the Examiner cites to Fig. 24 in Alten as being similar to the claimed electronic message of Claim 10 indicating the availability of a television programming. The pay per view confirmation of Fig. 24, however, is used for a different function, where the confirmation is used to confirm whether or not a user wants to order a specific movie, in this case "Passenger 57". This pay per view confirmation is not the same thing as "sending an electronic message to the user at the at an e-mail address to notify said user of an availability of said television program".

Furthermore, the claim requires that the claimed e-mail of Claim 11 be sent "upon successful conclusion of said search". The search claimed in Claim 10 is a different operation than the ordering of a movie as shown in Figs. 22 and 23 of Alten; as such an operation is to purchase a viewing of a movie. Additionally, Alten does not disclose or suggest why a user would want the results of purchasing a movie would or should be transmitted as e-mail to "an e-mail address" which in the manner suggested by the Examiner. A user would probably want to confirm the purchase of a movie at the time the movie was being purchased, versus having the results of such a confirmation transmitted to a remote e-mail address to an apparatus that exists away from a television system.

The Examiner, in the Office Action, argues against the Applicant's remarks that the use of e-mail with Alten is obvious because "using the e-mail for automatically or electronically passed back for information between

users/computers through the computer network is a well known feature in the art at the time the invention was made".

Examiner cites to a section of Alten as supporting this conclusion. Specifically, the Examiner writes, "the data stream can be transmitted on the cable line in any number of ways and those skilled in the art will understand that numerous transmission schemes may be used to transmit the data stream," (Alten, col. 7, lines 53-58). The paragraph to which the Examiner cites then discloses further ways a data provider, such as a broadcaster, may transmit a data stream, such as embedding the data stream in the vertical blanking interval of a program broadcast signal (Alten, col. 7, lines 58-63). This disclosure of Alten is based upon how a broadcaster or data provider can provide an input signal 11 to a receiver 12. This teaching of Alten has nothing to do with disclosing or suggestion how one could send an electronic message to a third party (either from a broadcaster or the receiver 12 based upon the results of a search) without applying hindsight analysis in view of the Applicant's invention (M.P.E.P. 2145).

The Examiner answer to the Applicant's argument about the application of hindsight analysis to the rejection of the Claim 11 that the "Applicant is reminded not only are the teachings of the prior art taken into consideration, but the level of the ordinary skill in the pertinent art. See *In re Luck*, 177 U.S.P.Q. 523 (C.C.P.A. 1973)," (Office Action, page 7). In such, the Applicant asserts that the Examiner has not established why one would want modify Alten to cause such a system to transmit a "program located" notification to an e-mail address away from a television receiver, but for the elements listed in Claim 11.

For the foregoing reasons given above, Applicant asserts that Claim 11 is patentable and requests that the Examiner reverse the rejection of this claim. Applicant also requests that the Examiner remove the rejection to Claim 21 for the same reasons listed for Claim 11.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, Appellant submits that the Examiner's rejection should be reversed as to Claims 1-12 and 19-21 and that the application is held to be in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Joel M. Fogelson, Attorney

Registration No. 43,613

609/734-6809

Patent Operations

Thomson Multimedia Licensing, Inc.

P.O. Box 5312

2 Independence Way

Princeton, New Jersey 08543

May 1, 2006

APPENDIX I - APPEALED CLAIMS

1. In a television system in which at least program title information for programs which are to be transmitted in the future is transmitted in advance to form a channel guide list, apparatus comprising:

memory means for storing data representing said channel guide list and an e-mail address, said memory means storing user-entered data;

data entry means for entering said user-entered data;

control means for performing a search of said channel guide listing for a match to specific user-entered information;

on-screen display means for displaying text or graphics under control of said control means; and

means for selecting a television program for viewing;

upon successful conclusion of said search, said control means sends an electronic message to the user at the e-mail address to notify said user of an availability of said television program.

2. The apparatus of claim 1 wherein, when television program-descriptive text accompanies said channel guide list, said control means performs a search of said television program-descriptive text for a particular text string which may relate to title, star, director, or context of said television program.

3. The apparatus of claim 2 wherein, in response to user-entered data said control means controls said on-screen display means to display a list of user-entered search criteria, and user-entered instructions for execution after successful completion of each search.

4. The apparatus of claim 3 wherein, said on-screen user-entered instructions for execution after successful completion of each search include instructions to record said television program and instructions to notify the user of an availability of said television program by sending said electronic message to said user.

5. The apparatus of claim 1 wherein, said control means notifies said user of said availability of said television program by sending said electronic message to said user.

6. The apparatus of claim 1 further including a remote control unit wherein, said user-entered data is entered by means of a screen displayed keyboard operated by selecting keys of said keyboard via cursor commands transmitted by said remote control unit.

7. The apparatus of claim 1 wherein, said user-entered search criteria form logically-ORed search terms.

8. The apparatus of claim 1 wherein, said user-entered search criteria form logically-ANDed search terms.

9. The apparatus of claim 1 wherein, said user-entered search criteria form logical compound statements employing logic operators, such as AND, OR, NOT, or XOR to logically-connect search terms.

10. In a system in which at least program title information for television programs which are to be transmitted in the future is transmitted to form a channel guide list, apparatus comprising:

memory means for storing both data representing said channel guide list and an e-mail address, said memory means storing user-entered data;

data entry means for entering said user-entered data;

control means for performing a search of said channel guide listing for a match to specific user-entered information;

on-screen display means for displaying text under control of said control means; and

upon successful conclusion of said search, said control means sends an electronic message to the e-mail address to notify said user of an availability of said television program.

11. In a television system in which at least program title information for programs which are to be transmitted in the future is transmitted in advance to form a channel guide list,

a television program searching method, comprising the steps of:

storing in a memory means data representing said channel guide list,

an e-mail address, and storing user-entered data;

performing a search of said channel guide listing for a match to specific user-entered information; and

upon successful conclusion of said search, sending an e-mail message to said e-mail address in response to a user request.

12. The method of claim 10 wherein, when television program-descriptive text accompanies said channel guide list, including the further step of:

performing a search of said television program-descriptive text for a particular text string which may relate to title, star, director, or context of said television program.

19. The system of Claim 1, wherein said electronic message is an e-mail message.

20. The system of Claim 10, wherein said electronic message is an e-mail message.

21. The method of claim 11, wherein said user entered data is entered via a data entry means.

Serial No. 09/748,952
Customer No. 24498

28

PATENT
PU010001

APPENDIX II - EVIDENCE

None submitted

Serial No. 09/748,952
Customer No. 24498

29

PATENT
PU010001

APPENDIX III - RELATED PROCEEDINGS

None